REMARKS

The Abstract has been canceled and a new Abstract has been added which is in conformance with 37 CFR§1.72(b).

Claims 9 has been canceled to obviate the objection that claim 9 lacked an antecedent basis, that the drawings were improper and that claim 9 failed to comply with 35 U.S.C.§112.

In response to the objection to claim 1, the number "(5)" at line 5 has been rewritten as --(4)-- and the word "on" has been rewritten as --of--. The text of claim 7 has also been revised to avoid the objection that the term "the action windings" lacked an antecedent basis.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§102(b) as being anticipated by Livings et al (FR2356992).

Reconsideration is requested.

The Livings et al. patent describes a device for controlling the power supply to a load in which two further motor coils 1 and 1' are associated to an electric motor 4. Figure 1 of the Livings et al patent shows a motor speed electric circuit in which a TRIAC 5 is provided. The position of the two coils is such that the TRIAC provides filtering in such a manner that no interferences are inserted on the feed line. The induction coils 1 and 1' in Livings et al. are typical anti-jamming filters which are avoided by the system of present invention.

Claim 1 points out coils that are disposed outside of the motor 4. According to typical electric symbol used in the drawings of Livings et al., the symbol discloses an electric motor comprising a stator provided with induction coils and a rotor. This means that the coils 1 and 1' of the French patent are filter coils analogous to the filters of the prior art cited at page 2 of the present application in which it is explained that an inductance inserted in series between the electric motor and the regulation device is provided for filtering the noise generated by the TRIAC. Livings et al. do not teach anything which relates to dividing the induction

coil provided inside the stator chassis of the motor into two portions as pointed out in amended claim 1 for the purpose of protecting the adjusting device and for separating the electric motor from the adjusting device.

Claim 1 points out that the motor coil is divided into two separate portions connected in series and the adjusting device is connected between said two portions. For these reasons, Living et al fails to anticipate the claimed electric motor and it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as being unpatentable over Livings et al. in view of Enescu.

Reconsideration is requested.

The Livings et al. patent has been distinguished from amended claim 1 above which is the claim from which claims 7 and 8 depend. The Enescu patent is concerned with suppressing radio interference induced by an asynchronous motor by using the inductance of the motor windings as a part of the noise filtering circuit. There is no suggestion to use an antijamming filter as a part of the variable speed control system. For these reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

James V. Costigan
Registration No.: 25,669

Mailing Address
Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10036
(212) 302-8989

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 11/10/05